DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 468 527 EA 031 955

AUTHOR	Teske, Paul E.; Schneider, Mark
TITLE	The Importance of Leadership: The Role of School Principals. Grant Report.
PUB DATE	1999-09-00
NOTE	36p.; Report supported by a grant from the PricewaterhouseCoopers Endowment for the Business of Government.
AVAILABLE FROM	The PricewaterhouseCoopers Endowment for The Business of Government, 1616 North Fort Meyer Drive, Arlington VA 22209. Tel: 703-741-1077; Fax: 703-741-1076; e-mail: endowment@us.pwcglobal.com. Web site: http://www.endowment.pwcglobal.com. For full text: http://www.endowment.pwcglobal.com/pdfs/Import_of_Leadership.pdf.
PUB TYPE	Reports - Evaluative (142)
EDRS PRICE	EDRS Price MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS	*Administrator Effectiveness; *Administrator Role; Elementary Secondary Education; *Leadership; *Leadership Styles; Occupational Information; *Principals; Public Schools
IDENTIFIERS	New York City Board of Education

ABSTRACT

Many inner-city schools are performing poorly. Measurable outputs, such as test scores and graduation rates, are low, while schools are often unsafe. Some schools, however, still manage to provide a high-quality education for their students. In this study, leadership was examined as a factor in the creation of good schools. Eight principals of high-performing schools in New York City were interviewed. Despite great variability in monetary resources, parental involvement, and school and class sizes, the essential ingredients to high performance appear to be autonomy and strong leadership. Four common features among the principals interviewed include controlling staff hiring and development practices, experience, creating and maintaining a coherent educational mission throughout all grades, and having high expectations for students. Principal autonomy is often neglected in the literature. The authors recommend that large bureaucratic school systems grant principals greater autonomy, particularly as principals prove capable of generating success. Accountability will be preserved. Greater autonomy and more rewards for success are likely to encourage more effective leaders to emerge and to stay in New York City and other urban public schools. (Contains 41 references.) (RT)

Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made
from the original document.

ED 468 527

Grant Report

September 1999

The Importance of Leadership:

The Role of School Principals

Paul E. Teske
Professor and Director of Graduate Studies
Political Science Department
State University of New York at Stony Brook

Mark Schneider
Professor and Departmental Chairman
Political Science Department
State University of New York at Stony Brook

EA031955

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)
☑ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.
• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE AND DISSEMINATE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
K. KLYBERG
TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)
1

The PricewaterhouseCoopers Endowment for
The Business of Government

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

The PricewaterhouseCoopers Endowment for

The Business of Government

About The Endowment

Through grants for Research, Thought Leadership Forums, and the SES Leadership Program, The PricewaterhouseCoopers Endowment for The Business of Government stimulates research and facilitates discussion on new approaches to improving the effectiveness of government at the federal, state, local, and international levels. All grants are competitive.

Founded in 1998 by PricewaterhouseCoopers, The Endowment is one of the ways that PricewaterhouseCoopers seeks to advance knowledge on how to improve public sector effectiveness. The PricewaterhouseCoopers Endowment focuses on the future of the operation and management of the public sector.

The Importance of Leadership:
The Role of School Principals

Paul E. Teske
Professor and Director of Graduate Studies
Political Science Department
State University of New York at Stony Brook

Mark Schneider
Professor and Departmental Chairman
Political Science Department
State University of New York at Stony Brook

September 1999

The authors wish to acknowledge the research support of Miriam Frank and Jessica Scianna.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Foreword 4

Executive Summary 5

Introduction 7

Principals as School Leaders: A Review of the Literature 9

The Role of Principals in Creating Effective Schools: The Case of New York City 11

Profiles of Successful School Principals 13
- Elementary Schools
  - P.S. 161 13
  - C.E.S. 42 14
  - P.S. 29 15
  - P.S. 363 16
- Intermediate and High Schools 17
  - The New School for Research in the Natural and Social Sciences 17
  - JHS 99 18
  - International High School 19
  - Landmark High School 19

Principals as Leaders of Successful Schools 21

Conclusion 23

Recommendation 25

Appendix: Methodology 27

References 28

About the Authors 31

Key Contact Information 32

Foreword

September 1999

On behalf of The PricewaterhouseCoopers Endowment of The Business of Government, we are pleased to present this report by Paul Teske and Mark Schneider entitled, "The Importance of Leadership: The Role of School Principals."

This report begins with the premise that leadership is an important factor in the creation of good schools. By interviewing principals in New York City's top performing schools, Teske and Schneider provide insights into commonalties among school principals who provide outstanding leadership to their schools. It should come as no surprise that principals, like other organizational leaders, set the tone for high achievement in their schools.

This report provides an opportunity to focus on what is right with schools. Through their interviews with principals, Teske and Schneider demonstrate the importance of empowering strong leaders to guide their organizations. In a time when educational reforms are introduced daily, we believe that this simple lesson — let principals lead — should inform the debate about future educational reforms.

Paul Lawrence
Partner, PricewaterhouseCoopers
Co-Chair, Endowment Advisory Board
paul.lawrence@us.pwcglobal.com

Ian Littman
Partner, PricewaterhouseCoopers
Co-Chair, Endowment Advisory Board
ian.littman@us.pwcglobal.com

6

Executive Summary

Many inner-city schools are performing poorly. Measurable outputs, such as test scores and graduation rates, are low, while schools are often unsafe. But some schools still manage to provide a high-quality education for their students. How do they succeed?

In this study, we examine leadership as a factor in the creation of good schools. We interviewed a set of eight principals of high-performing public schools in New York City. We found several common dimensions to their leadership that appear to be important factors in developing high levels of school performance. Although we did not choose our schools randomly — and eight is a small sample of the nearly 1,000 public schools in New York City — we identify a set of patterns that we believe are associated with success.

We found that many of the inputs into education often emphasized in today's reforms were not critical to the success of these schools. For example, money was not a central issue for most of these successful principals — although they all would like additional resources, the problems they faced were not overwhelmingly resource-based. And, while parental involvement was important to some principals, other principals recognized limits on how much parents could help. Even more interesting was the range in the size of these highly successful schools: Some of these schools were large (1,400 in one elementary school) and others were small (200 students). Similarly, some had relatively small class sizes, while others had large and overflowing classes. In addition, some of these schools were "choice schools" in which parents and students actively sought admission, but most were traditional neighborhood schools drawing students from defined catchment areas.

In contrast to the great variability in these conditions, based on our observation of these successful schools, we argue that autonomy and strong leadership are essential ingredients to high performance, and we identify four commonalties across the actions of the principals we studied that contributed to their successes:

- Controlling staff hiring and development practices is critical to creating an effective community.
- Experience matters. All these principals had considerable time in the system.
- A coherent educational mission throughout all grades in the school helps mobilize the staff and the school community, though which theme is selected may matter less.
- High expectations for students, not just in rhetoric but also in practice, was common to every principal and they all expected everyone in the school community to live up to high standards and enforce those high expectations.

While many of our findings support previous studies on what makes an effective leader, the autono-

my the principal is given or is able to assert is often neglected in the literature. Thus, we recommend that large bureaucratic school systems must grant principals greater autonomy, particularly as principals prove capable of generating success.

We believe that reforms can achieve greater autonomy while preserving accountability. For example, under a system of greater parental choice, principals would remain not only somewhat accountable to actors above them in the educational hierarchy, but they would also be held directly accountable to parents and students who can "vote with their feet." And the increasing use of nationally normed tests and standards provides an objective test of the success of schools and their principals. Given these standards, we can give principals more autonomy to experiment with a variety of ways of meeting standards.

Though the type of excellent principals we interviewed are often said to be in short supply in New York City, there is no inherent reason for this shortage. Presently, principals are paid little more than experienced teachers, so such teachers have little incentive to take on greater responsibility, and New York City principals are paid far less than their suburban counterparts. Greater autonomy and more rewards for success are likely to encourage more effective leaders to emerge and to stay in New York City and other urban public schools.

Introduction

While educational reform movements have been fairly common throughout this century, the publication of the Department of Education's study "A Nation at Risk" in 1983 propelled education to an even more prominent place on the nation's political agenda. Since that report, myriad reforms designed to provide more American students with a better education have dotted the landscape. Indeed, the level of educational reform activity is now so intense that some analysts argue that we are engaged in too many reforms, without paying enough attention to whether these reforms actually work. In the resulting "policy churn," new reforms are introduced repeatedly without any sustained effort to integrate new approaches into the core practices and learning environment of the school (Hess 1999).

Based on our observations of a set of principals in New York City, we argue that despite these myriad reforms, there is one essential ingredient common to successful schools that is easily overlooked in pursuit of the educational "reform du jour" — and that is focused, consistent leadership by principals over time. We believe that such leadership is essential to high-performing schools, especially in central cities, because a strong principal defines the culture of schools and integrates the concern for high performance into the mission of the school. Moreover, we argue that change in school practices takes time, so that longevity in leadership is essential to the creation and maintenance of successful schools. Such longevity can also act as a corrective to hyperactive reform activity that is often concerned more with the "show" of reform rather than with actual improvement.

We are not alone in linking focused leadership and longevity to success. For example, Lee and Smith (1994: 32-3) argue that schools "should decide on a modest number of reform strategies, should work hard to see that these reforms are engaged profoundly in the school, should continue their commitment to those particular reforms over a sustained period, and should not attempt too many reforms simultaneously." Similarly, Hess argues, "Evidence on the performance of parochial schools and high-performing schools suggests that the best schools are able to develop expertise in specific approaches. School improvement required time, focus, and the commitment of core personnel. To succeed, the leadership must focus on selected reforms and then nurture those efforts in the schools." (Hess 1999: 7)

We also argue that one of the conditions linking leadership to strong schools is autonomy. In this, our position is congruent with the central vision motivating many of today's educational reforms, which share a vision of a system of education built around small, autonomous schools, unburdened by large administrative structures. Stimulated by the work of Coleman and colleagues (1966; 1982; 1987), numerous empirical studies have identified a set of factors that constitute a framework for school effectiveness (Purkey and Smith 1983; Rowan et al. 1983; Hallinger and Murphy 1986; James and Levin 1987; Hill et al. 1997). The school-

level variables that have been most commonly cited as central to the success of schools include: a clear school mission, a cohesive curriculum, high expectations for students, instructional leadership, instructional time that maximizes students' opportunity to learn, administrative autonomy, parent contact and involvement, and widespread student rewards.

These characteristics of effective schools stand in stark contrast to the characteristics of schools operating in the much more common heavily bureaucratized "factory model" of education that came from the pursuit of "one best system" of education (e.g., Darling-Hammond 1997; Hill et al. 1997). The resulting bureaucratization of education insulated schools from external forces while, paradoxically, reducing the discretion of school leaders, especially principals. Hill (1994:40) describes the limitations of this system:

> Rule-bound, it discourages initiative and risk taking in schools and systems facing unprecedented problems. Politically driven, it allows decisions reached from on high that satisfy as many people as possible to substitute for the professional judgement and initiative of competent, caring professionals in the school and classroom. Emphasizing compliance, it defines accountability as adherence to process, when results are the only appropriate standard. Organized to manage institutions and minimize conflict, it ties up resources of permanent staff and the management of routine operations.

We argue that one of the biggest costs of this overly bureaucratic system is the extent to which it restricts principals, prevents creative leadership, and ultimately reduces educational success.

Principals as School Leaders: A Review of the Literature

While the importance of principals to the quality of schools may seem obvious, in fact scholars have only recently begun to examine educational leadership. Studies on the topic suggest that in the past, principals were able to succeed, at least partially, by simply carrying out the directives of central administrators (Perez et al. 1999). But "management" by principals is no longer enough to meet today's educational challenges — instead principals must assume a greater leadership role.

According to Drake (1999) a leader "envisions goals, sets standards, and communicates in such a way that all associated directly or indirectly know where the school is going and what it means to the community." While managers rely on the authority given to them from above (Buhler 1995), leaders seek to create a cooperative culture in which everyone has a responsibility to lead and to suggest changes when necessary (Drake 1999; Perez et al. 1999). Still, since both managerial and leadership aspects must ultimately be integrated by the principal, it is important to understand the tensions between the two leadership forms.

Burns (1978) argues that there is a distinction between transactional and transformational leadership. Transactional leaders take a more managerial approach; they get things done by clearly defining the task to the followers and providing whatever immediate rewards they can. Transformational leaders, in contrast, work with both external environments and within the organization to map new directions, obtain necessary resources, and respond to present challenges and future threats. The transformational leader recognizes that change is imminent and even strives for its creation.

Applying this to schools, Aviolio and Bass (1988) argue that although transactional and transformational leadership can represent two discrete forms of leadership, effective school principals exhibit characteristics of both by maintaining short-term endeavors through transactional leadership and by inciting change as a transformational leader. A number of studies emphasize the importance of transformative leadership for school principals (Fullan 1996; Hord 1992; Leithwood, Tomlinson & Genge 1996; Wood 1998; Sergiovanni 1992; Conley 1997; Perez et al. 1999; Reed and Roberts 1998).

Other researchers have argued that the most important goal of a leader is to create an effective organizational culture (Schein 1985). By establishing a consistent and shared culture, the principal engages the staff, students, and community in a sense of belonging and a shared sense of commitment to the success of the school (Deal 1987; Deal and Peterson 1990; Sashkin and Walberg 1993; Purkey and Smith 1983). Deal and Peterson (1990: 7) define school culture as "the character of a school as it reflects deep patterns of values, beliefs, and traditions that have been formed over

the course of history." They found that successful principals tend to employ several common strategies to shape school culture. These include:

- a clear sense of what is important (history, values, and beliefs)
- selecting compatible faculty
- dealing with conflict
- setting a consistent example
- telling stories that illustrate shared values
- nurturing the traditions that reinforce school culture.

To the extent that the principal is able to include parents, staff, and students in implementing the principal's vision, all these actors are likely to share in the sense of accountability and responsibility for the vision (Perez et al. 1999).

The term "vision" is often used in the current context of leadership studies. According to Perez et al. (1999: 6) "a vision includes strategies for obtaining a desired outcome, provides a picture of what schooling should look like (i.e., its content) and how educators can recreate or process this mental picture in real life." Implementing a vision is not instantaneous; it requires repeated cycles of reflection, evaluation, and response, and only the principal can sustain it (Lashway 1997). A principal's vision must also be related to the existing needs and culture of the school (Keedy 1990), and it must be focused and consistent. Lee and Smith (1994: 158) analyzed performance from 820 secondary schools and found that coherent, sustained, and focused reforms resulted in the best outcomes for students.

Pushing further on this "bottom-line" connection, the issue is whether principals really can affect student achievement. Studies have shown that the establishment of an effective school culture and the academic success of students are positively correlated, thereby establishing principals as contributors to student achievement — the principal helps create the culture that, in turn, enhances student performance.

While case studies show a strong connection between principal leadership and student academic success, only a few reliable statistical studies examine this connection. Eberts and Stone (1988) surveyed 14,000 elementary schools to determine whether or not a principal's leadership does improve student achievement. They conclude that the principal's behavior does affect student performance levels, and that the principal's skills in conflict resolution and instructional leadership are the most important factors. In a follow-up study, Brewer (1993) found a positive correlation between the high academic standards set by the principal and student performance and test scores. Furthermore, Brewer (1993) showed that student achievement levels were higher in schools where the principal had hired like-minded teachers who shared the principal's goals and who were able to implement effectively the principal's vision. Clearly, this research suggests that strong leadership by principals can lead to effective schools with high student achievement.

A recent study of American high schools by *U.S. News & World Report* (1999) reinforces the importance of principals and suggests that parents shopping for schools should talk to principals, asking many of the kinds of questions we asked in our interviews. Specifically, their report suggests that principals should have an academic mission they can summarize easily, they should give teachers a stake in school leadership, and they should know how to seize opportunities to expand their autonomy.

We probe these and related issues further in our study.

The Role of Principals in Creating Effective Schools: The Case of New York City

Our goal is to understand how principals operating within a highly rule-bound public system are able to gain enough autonomy to implement their vision of effective education to create successful schools. In particular we study the aspects of leadership and vision that seem most important in changing school culture and in creating effective schools. To do this, we studied in-depth eight successful schools in New York City. To mirror the distribution of New York City public schools, we divided our set of schools into four elementary schools, two intermediate schools and two high schools. Below, we report the results of our fieldwork for the elementary schools first and then we discuss the results of our study of the junior and senior high schools.

A Brief History of New York City Schools

The New York City public school system is a massive, highly bureaucratic organization that serves more than 1 million children. The New York City school system has experienced many changes over time, most of which led to more bureaucratization. In the early 1800s, local non-profit organizations ran the schools for a small number of children. Over time, society recognized education as a valuable commodity, and as a way to achieve social change. The city government eventually took over control of public education to meet the growing demands of the population.

Philosophical and political battles emerged in this process, which Diane Ravitch (1974) characterizes as the "Great School Wars." The first "war" was over public financing of schools, the second was over shifting power from political machines to a central Board of Education, while the third was fought over the curriculum and length of the school day. The fourth, and most relevant here, was the fight over decentralization, which began in 1969.

Decentralization created 32 community districts that have some latitude to experiment with different forms of school organization. Elementary and intermediate schools are mostly under the jurisdiction of these 32 community districts, while the high schools are mostly controlled by the central Board of Education. The central Board of Education also maintains control over most of the school budgets, although districts have a limited range of flexibility. All of the schools are also governed by the central union contract with the city teachers, as well as union contracts with school principals and custodians.

Since decentralization, some districts have experimented with various forms of school choice for parents and greater autonomy for schools. Elsewhere we have examined the performance of one such district, District 4, encompassing East Harlem, in some detail (see, for example, Schneider, Teske, and Marschall, forthcoming).

Our goal is to identify the characteristics of principals that are associated with successful schools. Our first task was to identify successful schools and then to identify the role of the principal in creating such success.

Profiles of Successful School Principals

Before summarizing our findings across schools, we first present elements of each principal's leadership and vision, managerial style, approach to the school's diverse constituencies, and various contextual factors.

Elementary Schools

P.S. 161

Public School (P.S.) 161 is a neighborhood school located in Crown Heights, Brooklyn.[1] The school is overcrowded, leading to large class sizes that average 29 students in the kindergarten classes and as many as 35 students in the 5th grade classes. The school is a very high performer in all standardized tests. In a new New York State test, P.S. 161 achieved the second-highest 6th grade reading scores in the entire state, without any adjustment for demographic characteristics. As a result, the school has attracted national attention.

A visitor is immediately impressed by how well the school maintains a sense of organization and decorum. Uniforms are mandatory. Classroom walls and hallways are plastered with cheerful posters and examples of students' academic work. The high level of commitment to the students' academic success is apparent from banners displaying the names of various universities throughout the country in the front hall lobby.

Irwin Kurz has been the principal of P.S. 161 for 13 years.[2] Employed by the New York City school system for the past 30 years, Kurz was initially an elementary school teacher, then an assistant principal. A self-proclaimed benevolent dictator, Kurz holds all school participants and employees (teachers, parents, students, and staff) fully accountable for the responsibilities their respective roles require. He has clear goals, sets guidelines, and holds himself and others responsible for producing results. By continuously giving resources to his staff, Kurz aims to remove possible excuses for not achieving good results. Should teachers not be able to respond to his demands, Kurz has no qualms about firing them

[1] *The reader may be confused by the various names and terms for these New York City schools that follow. Historically, the NYC Board of Education assigned a number to each school building — for example, elementary schools are called Public Schools (PS) "x" such as P.D. 161. Similarly, Intermediate Schools (I.S.) and Junior High Schools (J.H.S.) — the terms differ mostly for historical reasons, although intermediate schools often have a different configuration of grades than grades 7-9 typical of many J.H.S.s — are also assigned a number. Some schools that formed more recently were started as "Community Schools" to emphasize their ties to neighborhoods. (hence C.E.S. 42). Many schools also have "names" in addition to their official numbers. In addition, some schools have broken up into "mini-schools" within a single building, as in J.H.S 99, described later, In addition, when we refer to "neighborhood schools," we mean those that gather their students form within a defined set of geographic boundaries, while " alternative schools" emphasize particular themes and allow students to choose to enroll in that school even if other schools are physically closer.*

[2] *In August 1999, Irwin Kurz was named one of five superintendents in the New York City school system to oversee failing schools. Mr. Kurz will be responsible for schools in Brooklyn.*

P.S. 161
AT A GLANCE

School (District)	District 17
Grades	K-8
Enrollment	1,400
% Black/Hispanic	90% / 8%
% Free Lunch Eligible	100%
Principal	Irwin Kurz

or suggesting that they relocate to another district or school.

Kurz states that the most critical aspect of his job is selecting staff. Thus, he personally interviews all the teachers, and hires only those he feels will best fit his vision. He believes that, despite his high expectations, his respect and fair treatment of the teachers is a significant factor in the high rate of teacher retention. Kurz only employs staff with extensive teaching experience; few of his teachers have less than six years of teaching experience. He has also implemented a peer observation program, where teachers can learn from observing each other.

The most important aspect of Kurz's vision is his emphasis on student performance. Without hesitation, he will implement whatever reform is necessary for the increased academic success of his students. For example, Kurz has established a standardized math program, mock tests, and paraprofessional tutoring for children who require extra assistance. He also has established a strong and consistent curriculum based on reading. He states that although nothing in this school is on the cutting edge, the school has achieved academic success primarily because everyone in the school shares his belief in the potential of every student.

In implementing his vision, Kurz at first encountered resistance from a community that was hesitant to change the status quo. Opposition came from both the parents and teachers, who were all used to a more laissez faire attitude in a school that had been ranked 13th out of 16 schools in its district. Following a difficult year of resistance, Kurz was able to change the attitude of the school community. The teachers' union representative we interviewed acknowledged that prior to Kurz, the school had a poor reputation. Kurz immediately set a tone of orderliness and strong expectations, which led to some successes, and to many teachers and parents adopting his vision. This parental support was reflected by 96 percent of his students agreeing voluntarily to wear uniforms.

Kurz does not complain about a paucity of resources but is more concerned with how they are allocated. In fact, he would rather have more space than additional money. Although Kurz professes to bending the New York City school system rules at least moderately, he claims that a mastery of the rules of the system is even more essential in gaining greater autonomy.

The representative to the teachers' union believes Kurz leads by example and that students and teachers emulate his devotion and commitment. Teacher morale is high and while Kurz pushes them hard, he does not look to break any teacher's contracts. Parents are involved in the school community and are kept well-informed, especially through PTA meetings. Several programs work to bring the school and community together.

Community Elementary School (C.E.S.) 42
C.E.S. 42 is a neighborhood school located in the central Bronx. Class sizes are large; according to teachers, they are too large, especially in grades K-2. Limited amounts of classroom seats are reserved for children outside the district. The school displays a definite sense of spirit, with bulletin boards, hallways, and classroom walls plastered with colorful posters and students' work. Uniforms are optional.

Sandra Kase has been principal of C.E.S. 42 for the past 12 years.[3] Prior to becoming principal, she spent 10 years as a teacher of early childhood edu-

[3] *After our interviews, Sandra Kase accepted a position working with the central Board on schools that were failing and had been placed on the state's special list of failed schools. An interesting future question is whether her ideas have become institutionalized or whether they require her sustained leadership presence.*

cation and as a resource teacher. Following her 10 years of teaching experience, Kase worked for the district office as a staff coordinator and administrator, where she was able to develop networks and to observe models of schools and principals.

C.E.S. 42
AT A GLANCE

School (District)	District 9
Grades	Pre K-5
Enrollment	620
% Black/Hispanic	52% / 48%
% Free Lunch Eligible	100%
Principal	Sandra Kase

Kase is a strong and aggressive leader. She has clear expectations of her teachers and requires that the staff support her ideas. When first coming to the school, she explained her vision and expectations to the teachers, and asked that they leave (she would help them find another school to work at) if they did not agree with her ideas. Although she says that the organizational culture of her school is "flat," rather than hierarchical, with everyone involved in the shared decision making, she has clear ideas of what she wants and will do whatever she can to implement her standards.

Kase wants the teachers to feel that accountability is shared. Teachers are hired using a school-based staffing option, in which a committee (which includes Kase as a member) is responsible for hiring new teachers. She feels that staff selection is of utmost importance. New teachers are hired after a formal interview, a classroom demonstration, and a writing sample. Since Kase believes that it is the job of the school to train the teachers, C.E.S. 42 has a strong mentoring system. Teachers of the same grade level share free periods, enabling them to work together and share ideas.

Before Kase became principal, the school employed a "drill and grill" curriculum, teaching only the basics. Kase's first goal was to modify the culture of the school by adding special programs, new clubs, and extracurricular activities.

On the practical side of instituting her vision, Kase made it a priority to renovate the building, an 80-year old structure. She painted walls, bought new desks, and hung up bulletin boards and posters.

Kase believes in community involvement. C.E.S. 42 has a neighborhood watch group, an active PTA, and strong parental support and involvement. Upon becoming principal, Kase approached the ministers in the community, asking for their help.

Kase believes that issues of money and space are only details in the obstacles encountered by a school principal. Her biggest challenge rests with the constantly changing rules set by the city, state, and federal government. But, mainly because of her successes, Kase was able to carve out autonomy for herself. Kase also gains greater autonomy by gathering money from outside grant sources for extra curriculum development in math, writing, science, art, computers, and music.

According to the school's teachers union representative, Kase's strong and effective leadership makes this school unique. Leadership is top-down and teachers have a solid grasp of what is expected of them. There is pressure for the teachers to succeed in terms of test scores, active parental involvement, and the continued progress of students. Kase's vision that every child has special abilities and talents is clear. Sometimes, however, the ideas and goals clash with the actual implementation. Class size is an interfering factor; it is difficult to reach each child when there are 32 children in a class. Furthermore, the ambitious portfolio assessments for each child are demanding on the teachers.

P.S. 29

P.S. 29 is a neighborhood school located in the South Bronx. Although the school aims for a small class size of 18 to 19 students, this year there are 22 to 25 children in each classroom, due in part to an influx of students enrolling from outside the school boundaries.

The principal, Dorothy Carmichael, was the assistant principal prior to 1996, when the long-serving

principal left. More than P.S. 161 and C.E.S. 42, the school has a broad-based system of management. Carmichael works very hard to implement a bottom-up decision-making team. This was illustrated by the fact that this was our only interview that included three other staffers in addition to the principal.

P.S. 29
AT A GLANCE

School (District)	District 7
Grades	Pre K-5
Enrollment	830
% Black/Hispanic	36% / 63%
% Free Lunch Eligible	98%
Principal	Dorothy Carmichael

Teachers and administrators choose textbooks and make decisions together. The school provides an extensive staff development program for entering teachers, making them feel comfortable both professionally and emotionally.

P.S. 29 is divided into units; each unit works to develop and assist one another. The teachers of the same grade level are all free once a week at the same time so they can collaborate on curriculum issues. Teachers have the leeway to teach the subjects in their own creative manner.

Carmichael expects that all students should be able to fulfill their potential and work to their fullest capabilities. While greater academic success is the primary goal for each student, she believes that children should be able to master other areas as well. Students of different ability levels are grouped heterogeneously; those students needing extra help stay after school for special programming. Other special programs include an integrated literature and science/mathematics curriculum, and a 4th-grade greeting card business.

According to Carmichael, the biggest obstacle to further success is the teachers' union contract. In trying to reallocate resources, she has faced some frustrating dead-ends and feels that some staff are often reluctant to go beyond what is prescribed of them.

The school has an active Parents' Association. Parents have been trained to work in classrooms together with teachers and para-professionals. Attempting to make parents feel more comfortable in the school, Carmichael has instituted educational programs and free medical screenings for the parents themselves.

According to both the assistant principal and a teacher within the school, the school's success comes from the fact that teachers feel that they are heard and respected; Carmichael is open-minded and flexible.

The Neighborhood School (P.S. 363)
P.S. 363, The Neighborhood School, is an alternative school of choice, located in Manhattan's East Village. Class sizes are large, but the classes are of mixed age and ability level. A neighborhood group started the school seven years ago (hence the name) in an effort to attract and accommodate the changing neighborhood, a very artistic and politically active area. Both students and staff portray a sense of individuality and informality. Hemphill (1997) describes students in the school with "purple hair" and "sitting on the floor," a style we also observed. The school perpetuates an atmosphere of respect and teamwork, providing a nurturing and supportive environment in which students develop a strong academic foundation and are encouraged to also fulfill their creative potential.

P.S. 363
AT A GLANCE

School (District)	District 1
Grades	Pre K-6
Enrollment	235
% Black/Hispanic	15% / 45%
% Free Lunch Eligible	100%
Principal	Judith Foster

Judith Foster, director of the Neighborhood School, was a substitute teacher for a number of years and a teacher in this school for seven years before becoming director. She still identifies with the teachers and includes them, as well as the needs of the parents and students, in her decision making. She hires teachers who share her vision, and if they do not work out she recommends that they go to another school. The teacher's representative supported these concepts and credited Foster for an open communicative environment. The PTA representative noted that Foster solves problems and runs the school but is careful to include everyone in her decisions.

The progressive pedagogy of the school emphasizes group learning as well as individual development and attention. There is also emphasis on the social and emotional development of the students. Foster feels that the curriculum is more in-depth than most other schools at the elementary level. Since the central Board of Education does not always agree with progressive pedagogy, this can create tensions; for example, Foster does not support standardized testing and feels that students can be evaluated in different and better ways.

The challenge in implementing her vision of the school was actually getting the school started. Over time, she has not changed the vision of the school but has tried to make the relationships between students, parents, teachers, and staff more friendly and open. Her biggest constraint is planning time within the school, as considerable time is spent at external meetings.

Next, we turn to the four intermediate and high schools we visited.

Intermediate and High Schools

The New School for Research in the Natural and Social Sciences (J.H.S. 230)
The New School for Research in the Natural and Social Sciences located in central Brooklyn, is part of a community district that has recently converted nine of its middle schools into magnet schools using a grant from the U.S. Department of Education. The district defines the goals of their magnet schools as: 1) implementation of high-quality classroom instruction for students in the curricular areas of the magnet program; 2) achievement of systemic reform, providing all students with the opportunity to achieve high standards; 3) design and implementation of innovative educational practices and methods; and 4) promotion of diversity balance. Parents from all over New York City can apply to have their children attend these schools, but preference is usually given to those students already in the district. Seats are determined by a lottery basis.

J.H.S. 230
AT A GLANCE

School (District)	District 15
Grades	6-8
Enrollment	200
% Black/Hispanic	20% / 35%
% Free Lunch Eligible	80%
Principal	Anthony Galitsis

Since the New School for Research in the Natural and Social Sciences just opened in September 1998, it cannot yet be legitimized as a "success." Still, the "buzz" about the school is very good, and parents in the district seem to like it.

The principal, Anthony Galitsis, has a Ph.D. in chemistry and has been in the New York City public school system for 35 years. For 12 years, he was Central Board Director of Science Curriculum.

The mission of the schools is "to provide students with the skills, background, and experience to become expert problem solvers." The school runs on the philosophy of Paul Brandwein's "ecology of achievement" where students get considerable hands-on research experience. The school emphasizes group work and uses the students' natural curiosity as a driving force for learning.

Galitsis explicitly employs a shared leadership style. New teachers are chosen by a panel of

teachers, parents, staff, and the principal. In creating this school, and as a pre-condition for accepting the job, Galitsis was given considerable autonomy by his district superintendent, who favors choice and school-level autonomy and accountability.

Galitsis works to create an open relationship with teachers, who are given the autonomy to explore teaching methods they feel are important. Given that the school combines math and science teaching together, the biggest obstacle they face is finding qualified teachers, many of whom come from the New School for Social Research in New York.

J.H.S. 99

Junior High School 99 is located in District 4, Manhattan, or East Harlem. District 4 is a national model for public school choice, having initiated choice in 1974. All junior high students in District 4 must choose a school to attend; there is no default neighborhood option. J.H.S 99 is far from the top school in the district, but it has improved substantially in recent years.

J.H.S. 99 is an alternative school that has four mini-schools within it, all directed by Leslie Moore. Moore has been in the New York City public system for 31 years and had been a director in another alternative school in District 4.

J.H.S. 99
AT A GLANCE

School (District)	District 4
Grades	6-8
Enrollment	1,100
% Black/Hispanic	34% / 58%
% Free Lunch Eligible	80%
Principal	Leslie Moore

The Manhattan East Center for Arts and Academics has over 275 students in the 6th, 7th, and 8th grades working on advanced coursework. The Academy of Environmental Science Secondary School (grades 7-12) focuses primarily on math and science. A visitor sees plenty of computers in the Julia de Burgos Academy of Computer Technology (grades 7 and 8). The fourth school is being converted into a computer-oriented school for bilingual students in kindergarten through 12th grade. Students are chosen for these schools based on district regulations, academic ability, and an interview.

Each of the four schools has a director with the autonomy to hire teachers who fit into the mission of that particular school. Moore views her role as that of "CEO," getting outside grants and bringing in special programs. She stays out of most "nitty-gritty" daily activities, unless she is called upon to solve an important problem.

When Moore took over in 1992, the school building was "a mess." Instead of student work on the walls, it had obscene graffiti. There had also been some controversy about her appointment because Moore is white, and the vast majority of school students are Hispanic or black. The first part of implementing her vision was to make the school a secure, nurturing environment for both children and teachers. She believes she was selected because she was perceived as "tough," which she said is accurate. She renounced any previous "deals or favors" people had made, and she "excessed" eight staff members who were not doing their jobs. Generally, she worked around union and bureaucratic constraints to get the staff members she wanted.

Moore does believe that financial resources could be enhanced. For example, she is budgeted about $35 per student per year for textbooks, which currently buys about one book. Thus, she spends considerable time seeking outside grants.

Moore believes that parent involvement is valuable but not critical to success. In fact, the current state mandate for Team Leadership, which includes 50 percent teachers and 50 percent parents, seems problematic to Moore in a junior high school setting where the students turn over every two to three years. The same parents will not continue on the team, causing low stability, high turnover, and the need for lots of ongoing training and re-training.

To Moore, success is defined by test scores, acceptance into selective, elite high schools, high levels of daily attendance, very low dropout rates, and safety of the building. Also, as a choice school, parents signal their interest by applying in large numbers. Total enrollment has grown from 750 to 1,100 students in recent years. The district has pushed Moore to accept the larger number, which she has done, but she does feel there is both a physical limit and a maximum size that they are now very close to.

A teacher representative agreed that morale was high and that teachers worked very hard for Moore, but enjoyed it. Few leave the school. Moore leads by making teachers feel like part of the team.

The International High School (IHS)

The IHS was founded in 1985 in collaboration with LaGuardia Community College at CUNY. It is an alternative, multicultural high school designed to help recent immigrants with varying degrees of English proficiency. There are 440 students attending the school. The principal is Eric Nadelstern. The mission of IHS is to provide its students with the linguistic, cultural, and cognitive skills needed for success in high school, college and beyond.

International High School
AT A GLANCE

Grades	9-12
Enrollment	400
% Black/Hispanic	25% / 38%
% Free Lunch Eligible	85%
Principal	Eric Nadelstern

Specifically, the school believes: 1) students should learn to speak English; 2) learning another language is an advantage; 3) high expectations along with support systems are essential for success; 4) students learn best in heterogeneous groupings; 5) in career-oriented internships; 6) teachers must participate actively in school decisions.

The school emphasizes team teaching and teachers develop the actual curriculum. Teachers are chosen by a panel of staff and are given considerable autonomy. There is generally no need to fire teachers, because of this selection method. Teachers work in groups to improve themselves. Currently, the curriculum is divided into 12 courses. While team teaching is the biggest strength of IHS it is also a challenge to overcome. Sometimes team teaching is more work for the teachers, and loyalty sometimes flows more to the team effort rather than to the school as a whole.

Nadelstern's leadership style is to let teachers have as much control and autonomy as they prove themselves capable. Teachers, instead of only the principal, help to evaluate each other. Decision-making is shared collectively by parents, teachers, and students. Maneuvering around the central Board of Education is crucial in order to develop the school in the ways that Nadelstern sees as necessary.

The Landmark High School

Landmark High School is located on West 58th Street in Manhattan in the upper floors of a larger school building. The school was started in 1993 with the mission of dealing with at-risk students who would otherwise drop out of high school. The school receives financial support from the Annenberg Foundation.

In theory, half of the students are chosen from a list by the school and the other half are chosen by the Board of Education. In reality, though, the rules are not clear and the city system often "dumps" children in the school at the last minute, often

Landmark High School
AT A GLANCE

Grades	9-12
Enrollment	330
% Black/Hispanic	25% / 71%
% Free Lunch Eligible	83%
Principal	Sylvia Rabiner

those with the biggest problems, who end up taking up the most time of teachers and staff.

The principal, Sylvia Rabiner, uses a leadership style that is consultative but top-down. She relies on creativity in dealing with bureaucratic constraints. She "counsels out" teachers who do not fit with the school's mission and helps to find them another job through her school system contacts. Teachers have some autonomy within the school's framework, but not an unlimited amount.

Her vision largely involves day-to-day coping with the myriad problems of the students. Success is defined by graduation and pursuit of further education by the students. Rabiner finds that she must often utilize creative maneuvering to circumvent the restrictions of the central Board of Education to accomplish the goals of the school.

Rabiner feels that the soft money grant from the Annenberg Foundation is critical to her school's mission. One example is a school yearbook. The Board of Education said she had to use student affairs money to pay for it, but there was only $320 allocated for it. A high school yearbook costs about $6,000, so only through the flexibility of the Annenberg money were they able to have one. In addition, one cannot "roll over" Board of Education budget monies from one year to the next, limiting flexibility.

The school has a five-year waiver from standard testing, and utilizes portfolio assessment, around which the whole curriculum and school organization is structured. Rabiner is concerned that the current push for standardized testing and "one size fits all" will jeopardize her school's approach.

Principals as Leaders of Successful Schools

All of the schools we studied are high value-added and/or high-performing schools — but they vary on many important dimensions. Class sizes ranged from large to small, children of different ability levels were either integrated or separated, management was both collective and top down, teaching styles were either formal or informal in nature, halls were quiet and orderly or loud and lively, parents were intimately involved or not closely involved, and school size varied widely, from 200 to 1,400 students. However, there was one thing shared by all these high-performing schools: strong and consistent leadership by the school principal.

Each principal we studied was integral to defining the culture of the school, whether they had created it or adapted to it. At the elementary school level, Kurz's exceptional professionalism and organizational skills coupled with a quiet but stern demeanor structure the atmosphere of the school: Students walked in orderly lines, teachers dressed in professional business attire, and attention was paid to the cleanliness of the school. Kase's approach employed similar characteristics, but in a more relaxed environment. At the other extreme, Foster's open approach to child development and problem solving is mirrored by her collective office space; students, parents, teachers, and even a rabbit frequent Foster's space, a spatial exemplar of the constant interaction between students, staff, and administration. In between, Carmichael simultaneously fashioned a sense of leadership, respect, and authority for herself, while stressing the importance of teachers' contributions and collaboration. Since they came into dysfunctional schools, Kurz and Kase can be considered the most transformational leaders, while Carmichael was part of a continuing success story, and Foster was part of an effort to explicitly create a new school and culture.

At the higher grade levels, there was also variation on the theme of strong leadership. Like Foster, both Galitsis and Moore were essentially starting up new operations, with different approaches, one from scratch, one by re-orienting existing programs. While both high school principals, Rabiner and Nadelstern, work with a challenging student population, they have developed creative teaching approaches that seem to be working. Galitsis and Nadelstern seem oriented more to sharing responsibility, while conditions lead Moore and Rabiner to asset their own authority more within the school.

Despite these differences, all of these principals were exceptional leaders. They all worked to develop both a clear and consistent school culture and a community that is supportive of the school. As a result of their leadership, all of these high-performing schools possess the criteria set forth by Deal and Paterson (1990) in their definition of an effective school. They share a strong set of values that support a safe environment; high expectations for every student; a belief in the importance of basic skills instruction; clear performance goals and

continuous feedback; and strong leadership and a belief in its importance. Each principal had a vision and an articulated mission for their school. The specific mission varied across the schools, but in each school the mission is clear and has been consistent and stable over time. In all cases teachers and parents bought into the vision and culture that the principal created, in part because they were and are involved in that vision.

In short, while the exact nature of that vision and the associated pedagogical approaches do not seem essential, it is important that an articulated vision exists that permeates all aspects of school culture with consistency, clarity, and stability.

School Principals as Entrepreneurs

Schneider and Teske (1995) have studied public entrepreneurs — individuals who have revitalized and transformed local governments. They argue that an effective entrepreneur (or to use other terminology a transformational leader) is:

- alert to opportunity and unfulfilled needs
- able to carry the reputational and emotional risk involved in pursuing a course of action with uncertain consequences, and
- able to assemble and coordinate teams or networks of individuals and organizations that have the talents and resources necessary to undertake change.

The principals we studied have many of the hallmarks of the other public entrepreneurs Schneider and Teske analyzed. In an era where the autonomy of the school principal is being constantly challenged, the success of these schools was created by the principal, as they initially took risks, seized opportunities, and worked to establish a cohesive, like-minded network of parents, teachers, and staff.

All of these principals felt that much of their success came from having some autonomy from the central Board of Education constraints. In practical terms, each principal had considerable experience within the school system. This allowed them to learn, firsthand, what worked, and what rules could be ignored and what rules could not be ignored.This suggests that even these successful principals, individuals who should have "earned" a certain amount of autonomy from central administrators, are still not given enough freedom to run their schools in a manner consistent with their pursuit of quality education. These principals all fought to increase the policy space they had, describing autonomy as something they "took" rather than something that was "given" to them.

Not surprisingly, given the labor intensity of education, in schools at both the elementary and secondary level, the most important issue facing these principals seems to be their relationship to teachers. All of these principals emphasize the need to have teachers who share their vision. These principals have developed various ways to ensure that their teachers are team players. For example, in many of these schools a panel of teachers, parents, staff, and the principal jointly choose new teachers, and by so doing help to ensure that new teachers understand and buy into the mission and style of the school. Since, given the union contract, it is difficult to simply fire a teacher, the most successful principals have evolved strategies to help teachers who don't buy into the vision find alternative schools, "counseling them out" and working with the district to find another school for them (on the issue of the teacher's contract and principal discretion, see Ballou 1999).

This personnel strategy is essential for a variety of reasons. Most obviously, having developed this shared culture among the staff, most of these principals give their teachers a large degree of autonomy, which teachers appreciate and which allows them to develop professionally. As in any team situation, when the players share a vision, the need to monitor individual members declines, and more energy can be devoted to the real tasks of the organization.

Given that principals in the New York City public school system earn only a little more than advanced teachers, who have far fewer headaches, and earn far less (as much as 50 percent less) than principals in nearby suburban schools, it is no wonder more exceptional principals do not emerge. It is also a wonderful surprise that at least these strong and successful principal did emerge and stay in the system.

Conclusion

Leaders are an Essential Ingredient of Successful Schools

Although our schools were not chosen randomly — and eight is a small sample of the nearly 1,000 public schools in New York City — some patterns are nonetheless evident in our study.

First, it is important to note that many of the inputs into education that are often emphasized by different educational reforms were not critical to the success of the schools we studied. For example, for most of these successful principals money was not a central issue — although they all would like additional resources, the problems they faced were not overwhelmingly resource-based. And, while parental involvement was important to some principals, other principals recognized limits on how much parents could help.

For us, even more interesting was the range in the size of these highly successful schools: Some of these schools were large (1,400 in one elementary school) and others were small (200 students). Similarly, some had relatively small class sizes, while others had large and overflowing classes.

Finally, some of these schools were schools of choice, but most were not. Choice gives school leadership more autonomy, since alternative schools and schools of choice are subject to fewer restrictions than their regular public school counterparts in New York City. But in the high-performing neighborhood schools in our study, the principals had developed strategies to assert autonomy from the central Board and to create effective schools, even without being a designated choice school.

Despite this wide range in school structure and resources, we do not mean to imply that successful schools are idiosyncratic creations. We believe that leadership is an essential ingredient and that there are commonalities across the actions of these successful principals that contributed to their successes:

- **Controlling staff hiring and development practices is critical.** This allows teachers to develop professionally and frees the principal from many of the time-consuming tasks of dealing with staff who do not or cannot work together.
- **Experience matters.** All these principals had considerable time in the system and drew on this knowledge base to identify strategies that gave them the policy space to pursue their goals.
- **A coherent educational mission throughout all grades in the school.** A defined articulated mission helps mobilize the staff and the school community. But it is important to realize that while a coherent mission was common in all these schools, the specific approach to education varied widely across the schools.
- **High expectations for students, not just in rhetoric but in practice.** These beliefs were common to every principal we studied and they all expected everyone in the school community to live up to high standards and to enforce those high expectations.

Based on our observations, we argue that the leadership of the principal is a central factor for effective schools. While many of our findings support previous studies on what makes an effective leader, we believe that the autonomy the principal is given or is able to assert is often neglected in the literature. The principals in our study not only worked with what was already in the school, they also created and nurtured a productive school culture by innovative hiring practices and often bending the rules of the bureaucracy to achieve their critical tasks.

Recommendation

Increasing Autonomy is Essential for Leadership to Emerge

Based on our observations, we believe that greater autonomy is needed in large bureaucratic school systems to increase the number of successful schools. We selected the principals profiled here specifically for their successes — and virtually all of these successful leaders learned to seize autonomy within a highly rigid, rule-bound bureaucratic structure. Providing such autonomy more routinely would save considerable effort, free successful principals to pursue academic success, and generate more positive results for students.

However, we recognize that not all principals will effectively use greater autonomy. Some may use their increased freedom to pursue ineffective policies and inappropriate goals. Thus there is clearly a risk: If greater school-level autonomy leads to abuses at the school level, some *reasonable* regulations must be maintained to insure accountability to public standards. We believe that the level of bureaucratic control now in place — a system that emerged to deal with past problems and, as Chubb and Moe have argued, grew like "topsy" — is now excessive. We need to increase school autonomy while at the same time preserving accountability. There are changes that can do both. For example, we believe that under a system of greater parental choice, principals would also be held directly accountable to parents and students who can "vote with their feet." We think that increasing accountability through parental choice requires an increase in the amount of reliable information about the schools that is available (Schneider, 1999) and a better understanding of how parents will use that information (Schneider, Teske, and Marschall, forthcoming). But, realistically, principals are already the single set of school personnel that are held more accountable for outputs than anyone else in the system (Ballou 1999).

We also believe that the ongoing movement toward national and state standards and the move toward more uniform testing procedures will help produce tools for holding schools accountable while at the same time (and perhaps not obviously) create the conditions for more autonomy at the school level. Society will set the goals and standards, while schools will be given the autonomy to develop the ways of best achieving those ends.

Thus, we also recommend that school systems, especially large urban systems like New York City, act to reward successful principals more, and to reassign or terminate unsuccessful ones more frequently. The rewards can include salary increases, since principal salaries are low compared to the responsibilities of the job and to salary levels in nearby suburban school systems. But rewards must also include greater autonomy to make the job more interesting and rewarding. Autonomy is probably most important in the selection and retention of staff. Successful principals should also be given greater flexibility in the use of their school budget.

We also find that consistency of leadership is important. Here we agree strongly with Hess, who argues that frequent leadership turnover "disrupts administrative support and increases the emphasis on initiating rather than executing reform. The need to design and launch new initiatives reduces the resources available to diagnose problems and implement remedies." (Hess 1999: 160) Indeed, most of these successful principals have been in their positions for a number of years (or as in one case, followed in the steps of a leader who had been principal for a long period). We recommend that the system use some of the rewards noted above to try to maintain consistent leadership in successful schools.

Another common theme in the leadership style of the principals we studied was their respect for the teaching profession. To varying degrees, these principals gave autonomy to the teachers in their classrooms — because they trusted their teachers and had worked hard to make sure that teachers and staff were united in their beliefs and pedagogical approaches. To do this, staff development is clearly important. Teachers were made important members of the school community by their involvement in administrative decisions, and they helped to set the goals in several schools.

While it is important to develop good relationships with the teachers of the school, it may be even more important to choose the teachers that one is working with. These principals made success happen not only by transforming existing school practices but also by recruiting new members who supported the school's mission. Therefore, the principal plays a critical role in developing school culture not only by influencing the teachers and students within the school, but also by showing leadership when choosing the people that will belong to the community. At present, principals are only able to do this by going around standard New York City Board of Education procedures that emphasize hiring based on tenure, not suitability (see Ballou 1999 for details on this process).

There is no secret to the success of the effective school principal, no magic formulas, and no hidden models. Rather, the schools succeeded to a large degree because of the alert, consistent, resourceful, and sustaining energy of the school principal. There is no inherent reason that strong principals should be in such short supply in New York City and in other public school systems. Reforms that help to "deregulate" the schools are likely to create the conditions under which more such principals will emerge. More autonomy is essential and more rewards for success are also critical in encouraging such leaders to emerge.

But structural reforms need to be matched by a psychological change on the part of principals. While reforms that reduce central bureaucratic controls encourage those conditions, ultimately, to create better schools for more of our children, principals must think of themselves as both innovative managers and creative leaders.

28

Appendix

Methodology

Selecting Elementary Schools
We chose the particular elementary schools to study by first identifying "high-performing schools" using test score and demographic data. Using two separate studies (one by the Board of Education and one we prepared ourselves), we identified about a dozen schools that were performing at least 15 points higher than demographic characteristics would otherwise "predict."[4] We cross-referenced these schools against those selected in *The Parents' Guide to New York City's Best Elementary Schools* (Hemphill 1997). We then selected a stratified random sample of these high-performing schools in order to include a range of school types in terms of pedagogical approach and demographic makeup.

We contacted the schools we identified as potential participants by mail, followed by telephone inquiries about one week afterward to ensure receipt of the letter and to arrange for a date and time to meet with the principal. We interviewed school principals for at least 45 minutes with a prepared interview question format. The goal of these interviews was to understand the extent to which they changed the culture of their school and to identify the managerial reforms they credit most with improving performance. The principals' interviews provided both factual information with respect to their previous experience in education, beliefs, roles, and personal and school-wide values; the schools' present operations; and also valuable perception-based data based upon the principals' successes and failures in implementing many of the reforms and cultural changes. In most cases, we also interviewed the head of the teachers' associations and/or other parent leaders to gain another perspective on the principal's influence within the school community.

Selecting Intermediate and High Schools
Without a common metric of test scores across all such schools, we chose our two intermediate and two high schools based upon the reputation of the schools and their principals. We received recommendations from three knowledgeable sources: Clair Hemphill, award-winning journalist who covers and writes books about New York City public schools; Sy Fleigel, director of the Center For Educational Innovation; and Diane Ravitch, former U.S. deputy assistant secretary of education and scholar of the New York City system. We chose the specific schools for variation by area of the city and by type of school.

[4] *In more technical terms, we regressed the test scores of each elementary school against a set of student demographic characteristics (including NEP, LEP, turnover, and other demographic indicators). We then calculated the residuals from this regression equation. Schools whose observed performance was at least 15 points higher than that predicated by the regression equation were identified, and the schools we studied were selected from that population of high-performing schools.*

References

Anderson, Shirley. "High School Principals and School Reform: Lessons Learned From a Statewide Study of Project Re:Learning." *Educational Administration Quarterly* 31, 3: 405-423.

Aviolio, B. & B. Bass. 1988. "Transformational Leadership: Charisma and Beyond." In J. Hunt, B. Baliga, H. Dachler, and C. Shriesheim (eds.), *Emerging Leadership Vistas* (pp.29-49). Toronto: Lexington Books.

Ballou, Dale. 1999. "The New York City Teachers' Union Contract: Shackling Principals' Leadership." Civic Report by the Center for Civic Innovation at the Manhattan Institute, New York, New York.

Brewer, D.J. 1993. "Principals and Student Outcomes: Evidence from U.S. High Schools." *Economics of Education Review*. (12) 4:281-292.

Buhler, P. 1995. *Leaders vs. Managers*. Supervision. 56:24.

Burns, J.M. 1978. *Leadership*. New York: Harper & Row.

Chubb, John and Terry Moe. 1990. *Politics, Markets, and America's Schools*. Washington, D.C.: Brookings Institution.

Coleman, James, E.Q. Campell, C.J. Hobson, J. McPartland, A.M. Mood, F.D. Weinfeld, and R. L. York. 1966. *Equality of Educational Opportunity*. Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Press.

Conley, D.T. 1997. *Roadmap to Restructuring: Charting the Course of Change in American Education*. Eugene, OR: ERIC Clearinghouse on Educational Management, University of Oregon.

Deal, T. 1987. The Culture of Schools. In L. Sheive and M. Schoenheit (eds.) Leadership: Examining the Elusive. *The 1987 Yearbook of the Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development* (pp.1-15).

Deal, T.E. and K.D. Peterson. 1990. *The Principal's Role in Shaping School Culture*. Washington, D.C.: Department of Education, Office of Educational Research and Improvement.

Drake, Thelbert L. and William H. Roe. 1999. *The Principalship*. D. Stollenwerk (ed.) Upper Saddle River, NJ: Prentice Hall.

Eberts, R. and J.A. Stone. 1988. "Student Achievement in Public Schools: Do Principals Really Make a Difference?" *Economics of Education* Review (7)3: 291-299.

Fullan, M.G. 1996. Leadership for Change. In K. Leithwood, J. Chapman, D. Corson, P. Hallinger, and A. Hart (eds.) *International Handbook of Educational Leadership and Administration* (pp. 701-722). Dordrecht, The Netherlands: Kluwer Academic Press.

Gardner, Howard. 1995. *Leading Minds: An Anatomy of Leadership*. New York: Basic Books.

Goldman, Elise. "The Significance of Leadership Style." *Educational Leadership.* April 1998. (pp. 20-22).

Hanushek, Eric. 1986. "The Economics of Schooling: Production and Efficiency in Public Schools." *Journal of Economic Literature* 24:1141-1177.

Heck, R. 1992. Principals Instructional Leadership and School Performance: Implications for Policy Development. *Educational Evaluation and Policy Analysis.* 14 1):21-34.

Hemphill C. 1997. *The Parents' Guide to New York City's Best Public Elementary Schools.* NY: Soho Press.

Hess, Frederick. 1999. *Spinning Wheels: The Politics of Urban School Reform.* Washington, D.C.: Brookings Institution.

Hord, S.M. 1992. *Facilitative Leadership: The Imperative for Change.* Office of Educational Research and Improvement. Contract No. RP 91002003. Austin, TX: Southwest Educational Development Laboratory.

Keedy, J.L. 1991. *School Improvement Practices of Successful High School Principals.* West Carrollton, GA: The West Georgia Regional Center for Teacher Education.

Lashway, L. 1997. *Visionary Leadership.* Eric Digest 110) EA 028 072.

Lee, Valerie and Julia Smith. 1994. "Effects of High School Restructuring and Size on Gains in Achievement and Engagement for Early Secondary School Students." Madison, WI: Wisconsin Center for Education Research.

Leithwood, K. 1994. "Leadership for School Restructuring." *Educational Administration Quarterly* (29): 498-518.

Leithwood, K., D. Tomlinson & M. Genge. 1996. Transformative School Leadership. In K. A Leithwood, J. Chapman, D. Corson, P. Hallinger, & A. Hart (Eds.), *International Handbook of Educational Leadership and Administration: Part II* (pp. 785-840). Dordrecht, The Netherlands: Kluwer Academic.

Mitchell, D.E. & S. Tucker. 1992. Leadership as a Way of Thinking. *Educational Leadership.* 49(5), 30-35.

Perez, Anna L., Mike M. Milstein, Carolyn J. Wood, and David Jacquez. 1999. *How to Turn a School Around: What Principals Can Do.* Thousand Oaks, CA: Corwin Press.

Purkey, S.C. and M.S. Smith. 1983. Effective Schools: A Review. *The Elementary School Journal.* 83 (4):427-452.

Ravitch, Diane. *The Great School Wars: New York City 1805-1973: A History of the Public Schools as a Battlefield of Social Change.* New York: Basic Books. 1974.

Ravitch, Diane and Joseph Viteritti (ed.) *New Schools for a New Century: The Redesign of Urban Education.* New Haven: Yale University Press. 1997.

Reed, P. and A. Roberts. 1998. *An Investigation of Leadership in Effective and Noneffective Urban Schoolwide Project Schools.* Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association (San Diego, CA, April 13-17, 1998. ED 419 885.

Sashkin, M. and H.J. Walberg. *Educational Leadership and School Culture.* Berkeley, CA: McCutchan Publishing Corporation.

Schein, E.H. 1985. *Organizational Culture and Leadership.* San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Schneider, Mark. 1999. "Information and Choice in Educational Privatization." Paper prepared for the conference on educational privatization. The National Center for the Study of Privatization in Education. Columbia Teacher's College. New York: Columbia University. April 9th-10th, 1999

Schneider, Mark and Paul Teske. 1995. *Public Entrepreneurs: Agents for Change in American Government.* Princeton, NJ: Princeton University.

Schneider, Mark, Paul Teske, and Melissa Marschall. (forthcoming). *Choosing Schools: Consumer Choice and the Quality of American Schools.*

Schweigr, D.M. and C.R. Leana. 1986. Participation in decision making. In E. Locke (ed.) Generalizing from the laboratory to field settings: Findings from research in industrial organizational psychology, organizational behavior, and human resource management. Lexington, MA: Lexington Books.

Sergiovanni, T.J. 1992. Moral Leadership: Getting to the Heart of School Improvement. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

U.S. News & World Report. 1999. "Special Report: Outstanding American High Schools." January 18 issue. Multiple Authors.

Wood, C.J. 1998. Human Dimensions of Supervision. In G.R. Firth & E. F. Pajak (eds.) *Handbook of Research on School Supervision* (pp. 1085-1103). New York: Macmillan.

About the Authors

Paul E. Teske (left) and Mark Schneider (right)

Paul E. Teske is Professor and Director of Graduate Studies in the Political Science Department at SUNY Stony Brook, where he has taught for 12 years. He has written widely about public policy, regulation, and school choice. With Mark Schneider and Melissa Marschall, he is co-author of a forthcoming book on school choice. Dr. Teske earned his B.A. from University of North Carolina-Chapel Hill and his M.P.A. and Ph.D. degrees from Princeton University's Woodrow Wilson School of Public and International Affairs.

Mark Schneider is Professor and Chair of the same Department, where he has taught for 22 years. He has published numerous articles and several books on urban politics, public entrepreneurs, and school choice. Dr. Schneider is currently working on a large project studying the Internet as a means of delivering school-based information to help parents choose the schools their children attend. He earned his B.A. from Brooklyn College and his Ph.D. from University of North Carolina-Chapel Hill.

Key Contact Information

To contact the authors:

Paul E. Teske
Associate Professor
Department of Political Science
State University of New York at Stony Brook
Stony Brook State University of New York
Stony Brook, NY 11794-4392
(516) 632-7633

e-mail: pteske@datalab2.sbs.sunysb.edu

Mark Schneider
Professor and Chair
Department of Political Science
State University of New York at Stony Brook
Stony Brook State University of New York
Stony Brook, NY 11794-4392
(516) 632-7633

e-mail: mark@datalab2.sbs.sunysb.edu

ENDOWMENT REPORTS AVAILABLE

Managing Workfare: The Case of the Work Experience Program in the New York City Parks Department (June 1999)

Steven Cohen
Columbia University

Results of the Government Leadership Survey: A 1999 Survey of Federal Executives (June 1999)

Mark A. Abramson
Steven A. Clyburn
Elizabeth Mercier
PricewaterhouseCoopers

Credit Scoring and Loan Scoring: Tools for Improved Management of Federal Credit Programs (July 1999)

Thomas H. Stanton
Johns Hopkins University

The Importance of Leadership: The Role of School Principals (September 1999)

Paul E. Teske
Mark Schneider
State University of New York at Stony Brook

Leadership for Change: Case Studies in American Local Government (September 1999)

Robert B. Denhardt
Janet Vinzant Denhardt
Arizona State University

Managing Decentralized Departments: The Case of the U.S. Department of Health and Human Services (October 1999)

Beryl A. Radin
State University of New York at Albany

To download or order a copy of these reports, visit the Endowment website at: endowment.pwcglobal.com

About PricewaterhouseCoopers

PricewaterhouseCoopers (www.pwcglobal.com) helps its clients develop and execute integrated solutions to build value, manage risk and improve their performance. Drawing on the knowledge and skills of 150,000 people in 150 countries, we provide a full range of business advisory and consulting services to leading global, national and local companies and to public institutions. Our objective is to have measurable impact. Our goal is to work with clients to make the world a better place.

For additional information, contact:
Mark A. Abramson
Executive Director
The PricewaterhouseCoopers Endowment for
The Business of Government
1616 North Fort Myer Drive
Arlington, VA 22209

(703) 741-1077
fax: (703) 741-1076
e-mail: endowment@us.pwcglobal.com
website: endowment.pwcglobal.com

PRICEWATERHOUSECOOPERS

The PricewaterhouseCoopers Endowment for
The Business of Government

1616 North Fort Myer Drive
Arlington, VA 22209-3195

Bulk Rate
US Postage
PAID
Permit 1112
Merrifield, VA

AUTO********ALL FOR ADC 970
DR. PHILIP PIELE
DIRECTOR
ERIC CLEARINGHOUSE ON ED MGMT
UNIVERSITY OF OREGON
1787 AGATE ST
EUGENE OR 97403-1923

U.S. Department of Education
Office of Educational Research and Improvement (OERI)
National Library of Education (NLE)
Educational Resources Information Center (ERIC)

REPRODUCTION RELEASE

(Specific Document)

I. DOCUMENT IDENTIFICATION:

Title: The Importance of Leadership: The Role of School Principals

Author(s): Paul Teske + Mark Schneider

Corporate Source: Arthur Andersen Coopers Endowment for the Business of Govt.

Publication Date: Sept 1999

II. REPRODUCTION RELEASE:

In order to disseminate as widely as possible timely and significant materials of interest to the educational community, documents announced in the monthly abstract journal of the ERIC system, *Resources in Education* (RIE), are usually made available to users in microfiche, reproduced paper copy, and electronic media, and sold through the ERIC Document Reproduction Service (EDRS). Credit is given to the source of each document, and, if reproduction release is granted, one of the following notices is affixed to the document.

If permission is granted to reproduce and disseminate the identified document, please CHECK ONE of the following three options and sign at the bottom of the page.

The sample sticker shown below will be affixed to all Level 1 documents

PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE AND DISSEMINATE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Sample

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

1

Level 1 ↑ ☑

Check here for Level 1 release, permitting reproduction and dissemination in microfiche or other ERIC archival media (e.g., electronic) and paper copy.

The sample sticker shown below will be affixed to all Level 2A documents

PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE AND DISSEMINATE THIS MATERIAL IN MICROFICHE, AND IN ELECTRONIC MEDIA FOR ERIC COLLECTION SUBSCRIBERS ONLY, HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Sample

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

2A

Level 2A ↑ ☐

Check here for Level 2A release, permitting reproduction and dissemination in microfiche and in electronic media for ERIC archival collection subscribers only

The sample sticker shown below will be affixed to all Level 2B documents

PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE AND DISSEMINATE THIS MATERIAL IN MICROFICHE ONLY HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Sample

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

2B

Level 2B ↑ ☐

Check here for Level 2B release, permitting reproduction and dissemination in microfiche only

Documents will be processed as indicated provided reproduction quality permits.
If permission to reproduce is granted, but no box is checked, documents will be processed at Level 1.

I hereby grant to the Educational Resources Information Center (ERIC) nonexclusive permission to reproduce and disseminate this document as indicated above. Reproduction from the ERIC microfiche or electronic media by persons other than ERIC employees and its system contractors requires permission from the copyright holder. Exception is made for non-profit reproduction by libraries and other service agencies to satisfy information needs of educators in response to discrete inquiries.

Sign here, → please

Signature: Kimberly H. Glyberg	Printed Name/Position/Title: media Asst
Organization/Address: 1616 N Fort Myer Dr. Arlington VA 22209	Telephone: 703 741-2052 FAX: 703 741-1076
	E-Mail Address: K.m.Glyberg@us.pwcglobal.com Date: 8/28/00

(over)

III. DOCUMENT AVAILABILITY INFORMATION (FROM NON-ERIC SOURCE):

If permission to reproduce is not granted to ERIC, *or*, if you wish ERIC to cite the availability of the document from another source, please provide the following information regarding the availability of the document. (ERIC will not announce a document unless it is publicly available, and a dependable source can be specified. Contributors should also be aware that ERIC selection criteria are significantly more stringent for documents that cannot be made available through EDRS.)

Publisher/Distributor:
Address:
Price:

IV. REFERRAL OF ERIC TO COPYRIGHT/REPRODUCTION RIGHTS HOLDER:

If the right to grant this reproduction release is held by someone other than the addressee, please provide the appropriate name and address:

Name:
Address:

V. WHERE TO SEND THIS FORM:

Send this form to the following ERIC Clearinghouse:	ERIC Clearinghouse on Educational Management ~~1787 Agate Street~~ 5207 University of Oregon Eugene, OR 97403-5207 Attn: Acquisitions

However, if solicited by the ERIC Facility, or if making an unsolicited contribution to ERIC, return this form (and the document being contributed) to:

ERIC Processing and Reference Facility
4483-A Forbes Boulevard
Lanham, Maryland 20706

Telephone: 301-552-4200
Toll Free: 800-799-3742
FAX: 301-552-4700
e-mail: ericfac@inet.ed.gov
WWW: http://ericfac.piccard.csc.com

EFF-088 (Rev. 2/2000)